- REMARKS -

Claims 1 to 23 remain pending in the present application.

Claims 1 and 17 are presently amended to clarify the claimed subject matter and overcome the claim rejections.

The subject matter of the present amendment is fully supported by the overall original description, and specifically by at least paragraph [36].

The description is also amended to define the term "phoneme" as understood by a person skilled in the art, in new paragraph [20a]. Such subject matter is implied by the original use of the term "phoneme" and thus does not constitute new subject matter.

The present amendment therefore does not introduce new subject matter to the application.

Rejections of claims 1-5, 8-13, 15-21 and 23 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Schulz (U.S. 6,185,538)

In response to the rejection of claim 1, the Applicant submits that Schulz does not disclose the subject matter of amended claim 1.

More particularly, Schulz does not teach (1) "each of the basic units corresponding to a sound in a word" and (2) the basic units "being related to at least one of the time codes" as claimed in amended claim 1.

Schulz teaches in col. 4, lines 26-49 that "the speech recognition module 21 defines <u>words</u> in the audio source signals and writes the defined words as <u>a digital</u> <u>character sequence</u>", and that "a given time code value can be assigned to <u>each word</u> of the text" (emphasis added). Schulz therefore discloses a word level recognition and time code association.

Since Schulz teaches a word level recognition, Schulz does not teach "basic units corresponding to a sound in a word" as claimed.

Application No.: 10/067/131

Response to FOA dated May 29, 2007

In addition, a skilled person in the art would understand that a "phoneme" and a "grapheme" relates to the prior art definition as in the amended description (paragraph 20a), and thus that Schulz does not teach the recognition of a phoneme or its conversion to a grapheme as claimed in claims 2 and 3 respectively.

The Applicant therefore submits that the rejections of claims 2 and 3 are therefore improper in light of the interpretation of the claim and of the prior art by a skilled person in the art. The Applicant does not recognize where in Schulz such a phoneme and grapheme as claimed in claims 2 and 3 are taught. The Applicant requests a clarification or the specific wordings in Schulz describing the phoneme and grapheme as understood by a person skilled in the art.

Now concerning the lack of teachings by Schulz of (2), the basic units "being related to at least one of the time codes", the Applicant would like to clarify the understanding of Schulz's disclosure. The Applicant therefore submits that the "start time" and the "end time" in Schulz refer to "an edit start and/or edit end on the basis of the text (col. 5, lines 34-35 and Fig. 2)" (once translated from the audio source) for postediting purposes. This "start time" and "end time" has no relation with the speech recognition of each word.

In light of the above, Schulz therefore does not teach (1) "each of the basic units corresponding to a sound in a word" and (2) the basic units "being related to at least one of the time codes" as claimed in amended claim 1.

In view of the above remarks and amendments, the Applicant submits that the rejection of claim 1 is now overcome.

Arguments similar to those stated hereinabove concerning claim 1 also apply with respect to independent method claim 17 since claim 17 recites limitations similar to claim 1. The rejection of claim 17 is also deemed to be overcome.

In view of the above, the rejections of dependent claims 2-5, 8-13, 15-16, 18-21 and 23 should also fall since they depend on either one of claims 1 and 17.

Application No.: 10/067/131

Response to FOA dated May 29, 2007

- 10 -

The Applicant kindly requests a reconsideration of the claimed subject matter.

Rejections of claims 6-7, 14 and 22 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schulz in view of one of HON et al (2001/0044724) and Abe (6,404,978)

In view of the above arguments provided in response to novelty rejections over Schulz, reconsideration of the rejections of claims 6-7, 14 and 22 is respectfully requested.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, this application is now believed to be in condition for allowance and early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted, Jocelyne Côté et al.

By: /C. MARC BENOÎT/ C. Marc Benoît (Reg. No. 50,200) Agent of Record Tel: (514) 847-4462

Application No.: 10/067/131

Response to FOA dated May 29, 2007

DOCSMTL: 2467341\1